REMARKS

The independent claims have been amended better to describe applicants' invention. Claims 16 to 18 and 21 have been amended to overcome the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112, and a new claim 23 has been added similar to claim 22, but depending from claim 7. The claims before the Examiner thus are claims 6 to 8, 11 to 13, 16 to 18, and 21 to 23.

The specification has been revised as required.

The rejection of the claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1 to 6 of Patent 6,656,298 is most in view of the enclosed Terminal Disclaimer.

The rejection of the claims under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 is noted. The Examiner asked whether the high molecular weight material in claims 8, 16 to 18, and 21 is the same material recited in previous claims; the suggested change has been made. The Examiner stated there was insufficient antecedent basis for the terms "injection molding", "drying", and "firing" in claims 16, 18, and 21. The claims have been amended to include an appropriate indefinite article, where needed, which should overcome the rejection. The Examiner had stated it was

unclear if some of the resins listed in claim 22 overlapped with each other. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim, as it reads, is acceptable. While one resin could fall in more than one category, there is not necessarily overlap. No such criticism was made during the course of prosecution of the parent case.

The rejection of claims 6 to 8, 11 to 13, 16 to 18, and 21 and 22 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by JP '482, if applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed. The independent claims have been amended to state that the narrow band is located at the edge portions of the honeycomb structure, a feature clearly shown in the drawings and discussed in the specification, at, for example, page 10, lines 20 and 21, and the paragraph bridging pages 14 and 15 referring to "an edge portion."

JP '482 teaches applying organic material to all portions where no catalyst is loaded to save the noble metals to be used as a catalyst. In contrast, the present invention is directed to applying organic material on the circumferential wall (the surface of the most outer wall portion of the honeycomb

structure) to protect the corner portion of the wall from mechanical shock during transportation and the like.

The portion of the material to be applied is limited to the narrow edge portions of the outermost wall portion of the honeycomb structure. No such teaching or suggestion is found in the reference. The Examiner had stated that the coating in the reference " is considered to be a narrow band, since no further limitation is recited in the claim to describe the width of the coating band"; see the last sentence of the second full paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action. As indicated above, claims 6 and 7 have been amended to state that the narrow band is at the edge portion of the honeycomb structure. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of all claims under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by JP '652 is also respectfully traversed. The Examiner is directed to the arguments presented in the Preliminary Amendment filed with the application in support of of the patentability of the claims over this reference. Moreover, as stated above, the independent claims have been amended further to describe the narrow band better patentably to distinguish over the art.

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging the Certified Copy of the Priority Document filed in an earlier application and for listing references submitted with an Information Disclosure Statement.

In view of the foregoing revisions and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the case is condition for allowance and a USPTO paper to those ends is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if additional changes are required in the case prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted

STERTOE & JOHNSON

(b-(1)

Charles A. Wendel

Registration No. 24,453

Enclosure: Terminal Disclaimer

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 429-6415

CAW/cd Old Attorney Docket No. WATK:182B New Attorney Docket No. 28953.7182C2